

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Aldeandre Gray,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center; Officer Preilou,

Defendants.

) C/A No. 6:10-3047-CMC-KFM

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

**REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION
FOR PARTIAL DISMISSAL**

The plaintiff is a pre-trial detainee at the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center in Columbia, South Carolina. The Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center is the detention center for Richland County. The complaint alleges the use of excessive force by Defendant Preilou, and service of the complaint on Defendant Preilou has been ordered. The complaint also names the detention center as a defendant in this case.

Discussion

Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (DSC), the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints and petitions for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court. The *in forma pauperis* statute authorizes the district court to dismiss a case if it is satisfied that the action is frivolous or fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and (ii). As a *pro se* litigant, the petitioner's pleadings are accorded liberal construction and held to a less stringent standard than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)(*per curiam*). However, even under this less stringent standard, a *pro se* pleading remains subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore

a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dept. of Social Services*, 901 F.2d 387, 391 (4th Cir. 1990).

The Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center is a group of buildings or a facility. Inanimate objects - such as buildings, facilities, and grounds - do not act under color of state law. Hence, the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center is not a "person" subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. See *Allison v. California Adult Auth.*, 419 F.2d 822, 823 (9th Cir. 1969)(California Adult Authority and San Quentin Prison not "person[s]" subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983); *Preval v. Reno*, 57 F.Supp.2d 307, 310 (E.D. Va. 1999)("[T]he Piedmont Regional Jail is not a 'person,' and therefore not amenable to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983."); *Brooks v. Pembroke City Jail*, 722 F. Supp. 1294, 1301(E.D. N.C. 1989)("Claims under § 1983 are directed at 'persons' and the jail is not a person amenable to suit."); Cf. *Roach v. West Virginia Regional Jail and Correctional Facility*, 74 F.3d 46, 48 (4th Cir. 1996). The Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center should be dismissed as a defendant in this case.

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Judge dismiss the Defendant Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center as a party to this action. **The plaintiff's attention is directed to the notice on the following page.**

December 22, 2010
Greenville, South Carolina

s/Kevin F. McDonald
United States Magistrate Judge

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
300 E. Washington Street, Room 239
Greenville, South Carolina 29601

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).